



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

feet broad and eighteen feet deep. This 'trench' had been carried inland across the plain for about thirty-six miles to the Wall of Media. Then come sentences which, because they interrupt the narrative, many editors regard as an interpolation, from the notes of some editor or copyist. They may be translated as follows:

'Here are canals, flowing from the river Tigris; they are four in number, each one hundred feet broad, and very deep, and grain-bearing vessels sail on them. They empty into the Euphrates. They are about three miles apart, and there are bridges on them'.

Of the 'trench', referred to above, Xenophon now says that the King of Persia had built it, when he heard of Cyrus's coming, to serve as a line of defense. There was a passage only twenty feet wide between the trench and the river Euphrates.

But let us return to the bracketed words concerning the canals. They have to do with the irrigation work in Babylonia. Evidence enough in support of this work is to be found in the *Anabasis* 2.3.10:

'They came upon ditches and channels full of water, so that it was not possible to cross them without bridges. These bridges they made in part out of fallen palm trees, in part out of trees which they felled for the purpose'.

This passage means that the Greeks, now on their way home under the guidance of the Persians, had come upon the elaborate system of irrigation whereby the natural fertility of Babylonia was increased. In paragraph 13 of this chapter we read that Klearchus made all possible haste, 'because he suspected that the ditches were not always thus full of water, for it was not yet the time to irrigate the plains'. It was now October, and the time for irrigation was, of course the summer. Xenophon adds that Klearchos suspected that the King had let the water into the plain, in order that the Greeks might at once find themselves confronted with all sorts of difficulties with respect to their homeward journey.

In 2.4.13 Xenophon writes as follows:

'Presently they crossed two canals, the first by a regular bridge; the other was spanned by seven boats. These canals issued from the Tigris, and from them a whole system of minor trenches was cut, leading over the country—larger ones to begin with, and then smaller and smaller, till at last they became the merest runnel; like those in Greece used for watering millet fields'.

In Euripides, *Medea* 824-842 we have the famous passage in which the poet sings the praises of Athens:

'Happy indeed from days of old are the sons and the daughters of Erechtheus, and children are they of the blessed gods, feeding on the most glorious wisdom of a holy land, a land never ravaged, and ever pacing lightly through air most brilliant, in a land where the Pierian Muses, the stainless Nine, bore fair-haired Harmonia. And story tells, too, how, drawing the streams from Cephissus, the lovely-flowing Cephissus, the lady of Cyprus breathes o'er Attica breezes, well controlled, sweet-scented <and dewy with the waters of the Cephissus>, and they tell also that **always**, flinging about her tresses fragrant wreathes of rose-flowers,

she sends to Athens the Loves, assessors of wisdom, coworkers of virtue of every sort'.

Here we have, as Professor Earle remarked in his notes, "irrigation poetized". The Cephissus is the main stream of Athens; the Ilissus, in modern times at least, has been a mere brooklet, except in heavy rains. Attic farmers, ancient and modern, cut irrigating channels from the Cephissus. Baedeker, *Greece*⁴ (1909), says, on page 97:

"The water of the Cephissus is exhausted by irrigation before it reaches the sea".

See also E. A. Gardner, *Ancient Athens*, 7, 16, 135; C. H. Weller, *Athens and its Monuments*, 18.

In Aristophanes, *Nubes* 282, the chorus of clouds, entering, says:

'Let us soar from the deep-sounding bosom of Father Ocean to the leaf-tressed peaks of the lofty hills. There, from some height that gives wide vision, let us look down on the sacred land with its watered grain'.

Other references to irrigation may be found in Theophrastus, in the work entitled in English, *On the Causes of Plants*, 3.6.3; Plato, *Laws*, Book 8, 844 A. Pauly-Wissowa adds Plato, *Laws*, Book 6, 761.

There is a story, found in a fragment of Hesiod, and in Strabo 1.2.15, that Danaus, by discovering subterranean reservoirs of water, made 'Argos have water which before was unwatered'. This story may, though it need not, imply irrigation.

Strabo (4.6.7), in describing the gold mines in the country of the Salassi, states that they used the river Durias (now the Dorea Baltea) in washing the gold; indeed, they emptied the main bed of the river by the trenches they cut to draw the water to various points to aid in gold washing. This operation, though advantageous in gold hunting, hurt agriculture below, by depriving farmers of the use of this high lying river for irrigation purposes.

Plutarch, *Themistocles* 31, tells us that Themistocles, when he was Water Commissioner at Athens, had caused a statue known as the Water-Carrier, a maid in bronze, two cubits high, to be made, out of the fines he exacted from those whom he convicted of tapping and stealing the public water. This *may* refer to irrigation (compare the allusion, cited below, in Middleton, *Remains of Ancient Rome* 2.119, to mention of a like matter by Frontinus). C. K.

(To be concluded)

THE PLACE OF WINCKELMANN IN THE HISTORY OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP¹

The ninth of December, 1917, was the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Johann Joachim Winckelmann, who has been called the founder of the scientific study of classical archaeology and the father of the

¹An expansion of a few paragraphs from the author's paper, *The Two-hundredth Anniversary of Winckelmann*, in *The Monist* 28.76-122 (January, 1918).

modern criticism of art. It is a fitting time², therefore, to consider the influence which this man has exerted upon the world of aesthetics and to estimate the value of the service which he performed for posterity. By his life-work he overthrew the false taste in art and the wrong conception of classical learning which dominated Europe in his day, and he laid the firm and lasting foundations of a new point of view and a new science.

To understand the significance of the change wrought by Winckelmann's influence we must understand how it had come about that Italian taste, with its prejudice in favor of Latin studies over Greek and its indifference to the latter, slowly dominated European ideals and culture for two hundred years before Winckelmann's time. It will be necessary for us briefly to touch upon the salient points in the history of classical learning in the various countries of Europe which brought about these conditions.

The study of Greek, which had been so enthusiastically begun by the Greek immigrants and Italian humanists of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as well as the great period of Italian art beginning with 1300, which was so intimately connected with the commercial prosperity of the free states of Central and North Italy, began to languish after the first quarter of the sixteenth century. In the century before Byzantium fell, Petrarch, "the first of modern men", while chiefly interested, like his contemporaries, in Latin studies, also learned the rudiments of Greek and collected manuscripts of Homer and Plato. In 1333 he discovered, at Liege, the manuscript of Cicero's *Pro Archia*, and in 1345, at Verona, Cicero's letters to Atticus and Quintus, and thus gave a new impetus to the study of that writer. His contemporary, Boccaccio, found manuscripts of Ausonius and Martial; Salutati recovered Cicero's letters *Ad Familiares* in 1389, and the great humanist Poggio, in the years 1415-1417, found, at Cluny, Langres, and elsewhere in France and Germany, thirteen speeches of Cicero, besides many other manuscripts. Other scholars, Traversari, Landriani, Aurispa, continued these discoveries; thus Aurispa in 1423 brought 238 manuscripts of Greek writers from the East. The early Renaissance theory of a humanistic education is illustrated by many extant treatises in which the study of Latin was particularly inculcated. In 1392 Vergerio wrote the first, in which he maintained that Latin was the foundation of a liberal education; by 1400, however, he was studying Greek with Chrysoloras, one of the pioneers in spreading Greek in the West. In 1405, Bruni, another pupil of Chrysoloras, wrote a tract in which he laid down the principle that a 'sound and thorough knowledge of Latin' was the basis of true learning and he drew up a course of reading in Latin literature. Vegio, the Vergilian scholar, wrote a similar treatise before 1458, and Aeneas Piccolomini, later Pope Pius II, in 1450

composed a brief educational scheme in which Latin was predominant. In the earlier half of that century Vittorino da Feltre founded the first Renaissance School at Mantua and here Latin study was the chief interest, though attention was also paid to the great Greek writers.

Meanwhile an equal claim for the study of Greek was made by the educator Guarino, who had studied with Chrysoloras for five years at Constantinople. His love of Greek is evidenced by the pretty tale, that, while he was returning to Italy, the loss of a case of manuscripts by shipwreck caused him such distress that his hair turned gray in a single night. He composed grammars of both Latin and Greek and translated Strabo and Plutarch. His method is seen in passages from his son's treatise entitled *De Ordine Docendi et Studendi*, which appeared in 1459. In this work he maintained that the essentials of a liberal education consisted not only in the ability to write Latin verse, but also in 'familiarity with the language and literature of Greece', for 'without a knowledge of Greek, Latin scholarship is, in any sense, impossible'. By the fall of Constantinople, Italy became—in the language of her recent poet Carducci—"the sole heir and guardian of ancient civilization". But the great Revival had, as we have seen, long been under way. Many Greeks had migrated to Italy before that event—Bessarion, Gaza, Chalcondylas, etc.; a few others, like Lascaris, Musurus, Callierges, came later. The latter three helped in reviving interest in the study of Greek with the aid of the new art of printing. Still, the chief aim of the new humanism was the imitation of the style of Latin models.

The Renaissance ended with the sack of Rome in 1527. Even before that date Greek studies had declined and the interest in them had passed beyond the Alps. Let us see what caused this change. The decline in classical studies was primarily due to the loss of political independence in the Italian States during the disasters which befel them in the time of Michelangelo. Italy, the richest of lands, became the prey of foreign armies, and was no longer able, under the leadership of the Popes, to present a united front against invasion. An army of the Emperor Charles V sacked Rome in 1527 and took Pope Clement prisoner. In the same year another imperial army besieged Florence, which surrendered in 1530. The subsequent re-establishment of the Medici in that city in 1533 as hereditary dukes of the capital, and later of all Tuscany, meant the loss of Italian freedom. From this time until 1796—nearly two hundred and fifty years—Italy had no political history of its own; its annals were filled with dynastic and territorial changes and it became the theater of wars fought mostly by foreign princes for ambitions in which Italians had little interest. The cultured aristocracies which had long cultivated humanistic studies were irretrievably ruined. The predominant influence of the Church was unfriendly to the reverence of pagan, especially Hellenic, ideals,

²Pressure on the space of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY has unhappily delayed the publication of this paper. C. K.

and this attitude was bound to divert Italy from the classical heritage. Besides, the Greek elements in Roman literature and art had become so thoroughly assimilated at the close of antiquity in the Imperial Age, that now there were few Italians who had any idea of their independent origin. The Mohammedans were holding Greek lands in slavery; no one visited them to bring back a true knowledge to counteract the tendency to treat Roman studies as superior to Greek and to look upon them as original. Patriotism, moreover, led Italians to exalt their own land as the center of the old Roman Empire. They knew Italy's debt to Rome in both literature and art and enthusiastically imitated Roman models without knowing that these, for the most part, were copies from the Greeks. The very fact that the Italian language was the daughter of Latin made it easy for them to unlock the treasures of Latin literature. All these tendencies had finally made it the custom in Italy to ignore Greek studies and to prefer everything Roman.

As we have seen, the chief aim of the Italian humanists had been from the first to imitate Latin models. We see this in Petrarch's *Africa*, in the Latin poems of Politian, Sannazaro, and many others. Petrarch had imitated not only Vergil—the chief Latin name throughout the Middle Ages—but Cicero also, on discovering the manuscripts of the *Pro Archia*. The imitation of Cicero thus early begun was continued by a long line of humanists. The brilliant Erasmus, who, though born in the Netherlands, exerted his greatest influence elsewhere, in his celebrated dialogue entitled *Ciceronianus*, which appeared in 1528, mentioned one hundred and six of these imitators. In this work he denounced the slavish imitation of the great Roman writer, and maintained that 'to speak properly, we should adapt ourselves to the age in which we live—an age which differs completely from that of Cicero'. At Paris in 1500 he had taught that 'without Greek the amplest knowledge of Latin was imperfect'. He studied Greek in Italy for three years, 1506–1509, and taught it in Cambridge in 1511; in 1516 he edited the New Testament in the original, at Basel, and he helped in the organization of the College of Louvain by giving an importance to Greek equal to that of Latin and Hebrew. The influence against him in Italy, however, was too strong. The elder Scaliger defended the Ciceronians in 1531 and again in 1536, by declaiming against Greek in favor of Latin. The Frenchman Étienne Dolet in 1535 similarly spoke for the Latins and the contest was continued by many others into the seventeenth century. Scaliger's book of Latin verses—the *Poetice*, which appeared posthumously in 1561—remained a standard of taste in Italy and elsewhere down to the eighteenth century. Though the French historian de Thou exalted him above all scholars, both ancient and modern, for his learning and ability, we know that he looked upon classical studies only as an agreeable relaxation from the severer pursuits of life. Thus, within a century of the fall of

Constantinople, Italian learning and culture had received its characteristic Roman bias. This preference for Latin over Greek studies slowly spread over all Europe, until finally, in Winckelmann's day, Italian taste, founded on a wholly mistaken notion, ruled all cultivated nations.

In France the Greek tradition inaugurated by Janus Lascaris, who died in 1503, and which included Budaëus, the pupil of Lascaris, the elder Scaliger, who came to France in 1529, and such names as Turnebus, Lambinus, and Stephanus, soon began to wane. The French Schools were deserted by the younger Scaliger for Holland in 1593, by Casaubon for England in 1610, and by Salmasius for Holland in 1631. By the end of the barren seventeenth century classical enthusiasm had fallen so low that it yielded to a taste which took delight in ridiculing Greek studies. The age of the great Louis—the founder, in 1663, of the Academy of Inscriptions—was marked in the years 1687–1692 by the inane literary quarrel between Perrault and Boileau over the relative merits of the ancients and the moderns. In his book, *Parallele des Anciens et des Modernes*, Perrault, after superficially surveying ancient and modern literature, decided in favor of the latter. This diatribe against the ancients was chiefly aimed at the objective and impersonal character of their art. He compared the immortal lays of Homer with the ballads of the Parisian street singers and found the blind bard's heroes of lower stature than the courtiers of Versailles. This superficial book started a controversy which passed over to England and which again, in the days of de la Motte and Fénelon, returned to the land of its birth. La Motte was an enemy of Greek and similarly measured Homer by the rules of French romantic poetry. Voltaire, the dates of whose long life included those of Winckelmann, while expressing regret that 'the most beautiful language of the world' was neglected in France, and while praising the descriptive power and the naturalness of Homer, still had little higher conception of the divine poet than his contemporaries had. As we should expect from so slavish an imitator of Vergil, he was content to set the second, fourth, and sixth books of the *Aeneid* above not only the *Iliad*, but above all the other creations of the Greek poets. He even thought that the *Gerusalemme Liberata* was the equal of the *Iliad*. He admired Demosthenes's lofty tone, but looked upon Aristophanes as a mere farseur. Even Plato did not appeal to him because of his Christian spirit in making vice too repulsive and virtue too attractive. In his opinion Cicero was the equal of any Greek thinker. These are opinions which we might expect from this "inveterately superficial" writer, who, according to Carlyle, never gave utterance to a great thought. His idea of how an epic should be written is evidenced by his *Henriade*, which, by general consent, has been relegated in our day to the place of a School text.

In England, humanism—early represented by such names as Linacre, Grocyn, Lilye—had not yet recovered

in the seventeenth century from the effects of the Civil War. The first really great name in English classical scholarship is that of Richard Bentley, who was destined to become the greatest figure in the learned world of Europe during the earlier half of the eighteenth century. Sir William Temple, who knew not a word of Greek, nevertheless felt called upon to enter the controversy begun across the channel and to champion the ancients, in his essay *Upon the Ancient and Modern Learning*, which appeared in 1692. The statement that the best examples of Greek literature were the fables of Aesop and the Letters of Phalaris—which he looked upon as nearly contemporaneous—was a challenge to prolong the conflict. It was first accepted by Wotton, who, in his *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* (1694), calmly examined Sir William's essay. Bentley had told him that Aesop's fables were not by Aesop at all and that the Letters of Phalaris were a worthless forgery, and the work, perhaps, of a sophist who lived in the second century A.D. A second edition of Wotton's essay was followed in 1697 by Bentley's famous *Dissertation on Aesop and Phalaris*, the second edition of which, appearing in 1699, marked a new epoch, not only in English, but in European scholarship, by instituting a new era of scientific criticism. Perhaps nothing can show better the low state to which scholarship in England had sunk at this period than the fact that for some time yet learned opinion favored Temple instead of Bentley. We have interesting hints, in Macaulay's essay on Addison, of how Greek was neglected at Oxford at the end of the eighteenth century. While the great English writer had an intimate knowledge of Latin poetry and could write an excellent Latin style, his knowledge of Greek, which seems to have been looked upon as respectable at Oxford in his day, was evidently less than that acquired by many High School boys of to-day.

In Winckelmann's own land classical studies had fared little better. Their systematic pursuit, inaugurated in the fifteenth century by Huysmann and continued by the humanists Reuchlin, Melanchthon, and Camerarius, had already by the close of the sixteenth century begun to wane. The leaders of the Reformation³, Luther, Melanchthon, and the Swiss Zwingli, were all classically trained men. Most of the Latin Schools of the sixteenth century in Germany were founded under the direction of Melanchthon, and his educational ideas were also introduced into the Universities which he reorganized. In his *Discourse on Reforming the Studies of Youth*, which he, himself a youth of twenty-one, delivered as his inaugural on accepting the first professorship of Greek at Wittenberg, Melanchthon expressed his intention to plead the cause of the Classics against those who regarded them as 'more difficult than useful' and who maintained that 'Greek was studied only by disordered minds for display'. His appointment at Wittenberg marks an

epoch in German University education. Under this *praeceptor Germaniae* Wittenberg literally became the school of the nation. In renouncing the outworn scholastic educational methods he showed he was a true representative of the Renaissance and was fitted to be one of its greatest leaders in the North. In his lectures on Homer he announced that he, 'like Solomon, was seeking Tyrian brass and gems for the adornment of God's temple', and he was not forgetful of religion when he added that 'by going to the sources we are led to Christ'. However, despite its glorious beginning the Reformation was bound to be hostile to classical learning. Luther, who began his work at Wittenberg with lectures on the *Dialectics and Physics of Aristotle*, soon found the influence of the Stagirite harmful to his theology and finally came to look upon him as the personification of scholasticism, the arch-enemy of the Reformed Church. He, therefore, banished the *Ethics* and the *Metaphysics* from the University and retained only the *Rhetoric*, *Poetic*, and *Logic*, and these merely because he thought they would aid young men in preaching and praying. But the Protestant principle in art, isolated by the cleavage from Italian influence, was destined to cut Germany off from the great tradition of beauty and culture.

The Thirty Years War in the next century, like the Civil War in Britain, had a disastrous effect on all learning. Nor with the peace of Westphalia in 1648 did art or classical learning revive. The age of the giants of humanism had passed. After the death of Camerarius, in 1534, we do not find a name of importance in German classical scholarship for a hundred and fifty years, until we reach that of Johann Fabricius, who died in 1736, and even he is remembered most for his learning and industry, which have won him the title of the modern Didymus. The Flemish philologist Justus Lipsius, who taught at Leyden between 1579 and 1592, had long before heralded the decay of Hellenic studies in the North by saying that Greek was merely an ornament and not an indispensable possession for a scholar. Latin continued to be taught in the Schools and was still the medium of University instruction and the language of all learned men. But ancient literature was regarded as barren and non-essential. In Winckelmann's boyhood Greek was taught merely as the handmaid of theology, to help students of the Testament and early Church Fathers. No important Greek text had been published for a century and a half, from the time of Sylburg, toward the end of the sixteenth century, to that of Ernesti, whose edition of Xenophon's *Memorabilia* appeared in 1737. No work on Plato had appeared anywhere since 1602. Only selections of Greek writers, the so-called *Apospasmata*, could be had for class use. The study of art was almost unknown and scientific philology was yet to be created at Halle by Wolf at the end of the century. Porson's gibe, therefore, that "the Germans in Greek are sadly to seek", had a good deal of truth in it.

³See Dr. Buenger's paper, *The Classics and the Protestant Reformation*, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY II.34-37.

Only the seeds of the coming Revival in Greek studies had been sown. Gesner, Winckelmann's younger contemporary, who was the Professor of Eloquence at Göttingen for twenty-seven years until his death in 1761, was the first to reintroduce Greek authors into a University, by publishing his *Chrestomathia Graeca*, in 1731, when Winckelmann was a boy of fourteen. This event really marks the inception of the new spirit, by reawakening the old enthusiasm for ancient learning. It was Gesner's notion no longer to imitate Latin models, but to try to understand the content of both Latin and Greek literature. Though a Latinist, he set a high value on Greek, and was the first to teach any Greek outside of Church Greek, and so may be called the forerunner of the Revival soon to be inaugurated by Winckelmann, Lessing, and Goethe. The classical tradition was carried on by Ernesti, who, as Professor of Ancient Literature at Leipzig from 1742, was the only official exponent of Greek in a German University in Winckelmann's day; also by Reiske, who had a profound knowledge of both Greek and Arabic; and by Heyne, who lectured as the successor of Gesner at Göttingen for a half century, until his death in 1812. Johann Christ, Professor of History and Poetry at Leipzig after 1734, exhorted his students not to confine their attention to linguistics, but to include a knowledge of art as well, and so he may be looked upon as the immediate forerunner of Winckelmann in archaeology, as Gesner was of Wolf in philology.

It is significant of the condition of classical study in Germany in Winckelmann's day that its chief exponents—with the exception of Reiske—were such uncritical scholars as Gesner, Ernesti, and Heyne. Many greater philologists, like Wyttenbach and Ruhnken, had sought the more congenial atmosphere of the Netherlands for their teaching; while others, like Reiske, had been compelled to go there for study. Joseph Scaliger, on leaving France at the end of the sixteenth century, had referred to Holland as 'the only corner of Europe' suitable for a scholar. Classical scholarship there, which had extended from Erasmus to Grotius, was again flourishing in Winckelmann's day under the influence of Bentley's younger contemporary Hemsterhuys and the latter's famous pupils Ruhnken and Valckenaer. Hemsterhuys had founded the only true school of Greek learning which had existed in Europe since the days of Casaubon and Scaliger.

After the middle of the eighteenth century the prejudices in favor of Latin studies over Greek were destined to be overthrown, chiefly through the labors of one man—Winckelmann. Through his influence the custom of regarding the relics of antiquity on Italian soil as those of Roman civilization had to yield to a knowledge of the true origin of these things in Greece. In his first book, entitled *Thoughts on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture*, which appeared in 1755 just as he was leaving Germany for

Italy, Winckelmann for the first time discovered the distinction between a Greek original of sculpture and painting and a Roman copy. In the next thirteen years, down to his assassination in Trieste, his Roman studies, culminating in his two great works, *The History of Ancient Art*, and the *Monumenti inediti antichi*, which appeared in the years 1763 and 1767 respectively, were destined to revolutionize the aesthetic taste not only of Italy but of Europe. The idea that there was an independent Greek art from which Roman art was derived, though the veriest commonplace to us, was nothing short of a revelation to his contemporaries, who had never questioned the interpretation of works of art based on the early enthusiasm for Roman studies. He showed that the realistic Italian sculpture of his day, which was far more interested in anatomical accuracy and theatrical effect than in the expression of the beautiful, copied merely the decadent period of Greek art and that all such aims were opposed to the repose and simplicity of that art. With the disclosure that Roman art was derivative, there was also involved a new conception of the origin of other phases of Roman civilization; for, if it could be shown that Roman art was not original, it seemed clear that Roman literature and culture in general must depend on Greek.

This change in view-point was to be fundamental and permanent. An entirely new inspiration came to Europe, an inspiration comparable only with that of the early Renaissance itself. The taste of the succeeding period became Hellenic instead of remaining Roman. Everything Greek—art, literature, history—began to be studied for its own sake. The resulting expansion of interest in things Greek we call the Greek Revival or the Philhellenic Movement. We are unfortunately fated to see in our day the waning of the inspiration started by Winckelmann. This Revival which began even before Winckelmann's death, only came to fruition in the last years of the eighteenth century; it became the most prominent spiritual feature of later European history. Lessing, by the publication in 1766 of the *Laocöon*—a work whose inspiration can be traced directly to the ideas of Winckelmann—helped the nascent movement not only by critically analyzing the limitations of poetry and sculpture, but also by counteracting the perverted literary taste of the French critics. For his treatment of Homer and Sophocles marked an epoch not only in the appreciation of these writers, but of Greek literature generally. Goethe's transcendent genius raised it into the higher realms of poetry. But the foundation of it must be sought in the life work and purpose of Winckelmann. He is rightly called not only the founder of a new science, for the principles which he laid down for antiquarian investigation have been followed since with ever-increasing results, but also the greatest critic of the Beautiful. His influence was by no means confined to the world of scholarship. The manifestations of the Revival were manifold and far-reaching. The new impetus entered into not only the

spiritual structure of culture—the Fine Arts—but into politics and everyday life.

The new spirit affected not only Lessing and Goethe, but all the Augustan writers of Germany. But it soon passed the boundaries of Winckelmann's native land and influenced all European culture. Travel to Greek lands began, and a long line of English, French, Italian, German, Dutch and Scandinavian scholars studied the monuments on Greek soil and wrote accounts of what they saw and thus immeasurably enlarged the horizon of classical scholarship. The change in the work of sculpture and architecture was immense. In statuary the dramatic and the sentimental were replaced by Greek canons of restraint; in architecture the simplicity of form of Greek columnar structures became popular everywhere. Even in painting there was a return to Hellenic simplicity. In sculpture we see the new spirit expressed by the work of the Italian Canova, the Dane Thorwaldsen, the German Dannecker, and the English Gibson; in architecture by Vignon, Hittorf, and Chalgrin in France, by Soane, Inwood, and Wilkins in England, by Schinkel, von Klenze, and Semper in Germany, and by the architects of the older buildings in our own Eastern cities; in painting by the French David. Only after the first quarter of the nineteenth century did the imitation of Greek forms in architecture yield to more independent styles, like the Gothic, which had reached its zenith in 1850, when nearly every important Church built here and abroad was Gothic in style. In music the subjects of Gluck's operas were Greek; the poetry of every nation showed a strong Hellenic coloring. Even in dress the Greek influence was visible; the short-waisted Revolutionary style known as the *Directoire*—or in our own country as the *Martha Washington*—was merely an attempt to imitate Greek simplicity. Furniture also followed Greek patterns. In politics the influence can hardly be overestimated. The Revolutions in both America and France were largely influenced by the account of Republican institutions in the *Lives of Plutarch*, which was the most-read book of the day. Certainly the Greek War of Independence in the last century was due largely to the sympathy of European scholars and statesmen, especially those of England and France, men who were directly influenced by sentiments which had been awakened by the second Renaissance of Greek studies.

To have furnished the inspiration and stimulus for so great an upheaval in the spiritual history of the world is certainly an achievement of the highest order. As Walter Pater has said in his fascinating essay on Winckelmann

The highest that can be said of any critical effort is that it has given a new sense, that it has laid open a new organ.

And this is the tribute which he pays to Winckelmann. Hegel, in his *Lectures on the Philosophy of Art*, has given similar honor to the Saxon shoemaker's son: Winckelmann, by his contemplation of the ideal works

of the ancients, received a sort of inspiration through which he opened a new sense for the study of art. He is to be regarded as one of those who, in the sphere of art, have known how to initiate a new organ for the human spirit.

Winckelmann was a man to whom art was both religion and fatherland; when he wrote he was not thinking merely of Germany and Italy or of his own day, but of Europe and posterity. In estimating his life work we must remember that he entered an almost new field of criticism and that he wrote at a time when few masterpieces of Greek art were known. Almost no great works of the archaic period were then known and almost none of Phidias's Age. Consequently many of his historical conclusions are mistaken and have been modified or overthrown by subsequent criticism. His exaggerated praise, for instance, of such monuments as the Apollo and the Torso of the Belvedere, the Venus of Medici and the Laocoon, would find no echo to-day. The excellences which he saw in such works we can now see in far less contaminated form in monuments wholly unknown to him; hence the standard of judgment has entirely changed. As for the Laocoon especially, if Winckelmann or Lessing had seen the masterpieces of Greek sculpture, ranging from the Elgin marbles to the Pergamene altar frieze, neither would have fallen into the mistake of calling it a great masterpiece. On reading such praise as Winckelmann gave to it one might readily fall into the error of thinking that after all he never came near the Greek spirit of the best time; but, when we remember that he penetrated to the Greek spirit almost entirely through Roman copies and imitations, we can, perhaps, as in no other way, gauge his great powers of insight. We are amazed at his artistic sense, his erudition, his vigorous imagination, his unrivalled insight which enabled him to make remarkably true suggestions about epochs of art where there was little real information at hand. After all is said and done, Winckelmann's masterpiece, the *History of Ancient Art*, instituted the historical study of art and indicated not only the method but the spirit in which it should be approached. For this all subsequent investigation and criticism are deeply indebted to him.

UNIVERSITY OF
PENNSYLVANIA.

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE.

CLASSICAL CONFERENCE AT PRINCETON

As part of the 32nd Annual Convention of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, held at Princeton University, on November 29-30, there was a Classical Conference, on Saturday, November 30. Professor George Depue Hadzsits, of the University of Pennsylvania, presided.

The programme was unique, in several ways. First, there were but two papers. Secondly, neither paper was by a professed or professional classicist. The papers were as follows:

Things New and Old, Professor Lane Cooper, Cornell University; Latin and the War of Civilization, Mr. Paul Elmer More, formerly editor of *The Nation*.

It is hoped that these inspiring papers will be published in full. Our readers should be on the watch for them.

C. K.